

AMENDMENTS

In Response to the Examiner's Action dated 8 March 2001 (Application No. 09/616,870), please amend the present application as follows:

REMARKS

Applicant requests reconsideration of the above-mentioned application in view of the following discussion.

1. The Examiner has rejected claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 5,534,010 (Peterson). Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Claim 26 as once amended recites the features of a second section having a first linear margin and a second linear margin, the first section being integral to the second section at the first margin and the third section being integral to the second section at the second margin. This feature is neither claimed nor shown in the Peterson reference. The second section of Peterson has no linear margins. Rather, the Peterson reference teaches a device wherein the first and third sections include a linear margin to which second section filaments 46 are either connected to tape strips 18 or looped around notched hooks 72, 74, 76. The filamentous nature of the second section is unlike the second section claimed in the present application. The second section of the present application includes first and second linear margins, a feature not possible in the Peterson filamentous second section. This limitation is clearly stated in claim 26 as once amended. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be removed and claim 26 be passed to allowance.
2. Claims 26, 32, 36, 37, 47, 49, and 104 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,788,660 (Resnick). Applicant respectfully asserts

that since the earliest priority date of the present application antedates the filing date of the Resnick reference (20 October 1997), the Resnick reference is not available for prior art purposes. Therefore, it is requested that claims 26, 32, 36, 37, 47, 49, and 104 be placed in condition for allowance.


3. The Examiner has rejected claims 38 - 40 and 50 - 54 and 105 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Resnick. As stated with reference to paragraph 2, the earliest priority date of the present application antedates the filing date of the Resnick reference. Claims 38 - 40 and 50 - 54 and 105 are believed to be in condition for allowance.
4. The Examiner has indicated that claims 33 - 35, 43 - 46, 48 and 106 - 117, inclusive are allowed.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be removed, that claims 26, 32, 36 - 40, inclusive, 42, 47, 49 - 54, inclusive, 104 and 105, be passed to allowance along with previously allowed claims 33 - 35, 43 - 46, 48, and 106 - 117, inclusive.

Respectfully Submitted,

Inventor: Wallace J. Beaudry

By RYAN KROMHOLZ & MANION, S.C., Attorneys for Applicant

By 

DANIEL D. RYAN, Reg. No. 29,243
JOSEPH A. KROMHOLZ, Reg. No. 34,204
JOHN M. MANION, Reg. No. 38,957
ALLAN O. MAKI, Reg. No. 20,623
ARNOLD J. ERICSEN, Reg. No. 16,879
PATRICIA JONES, Reg. No. 46,318
LAURA A. DABLE, Reg. No. 46,436
DANIEL R. JOHNSON, Reg. No. 46,204
Telephone (262) 783-1300

LAD/jaw Scholar/12394A-PCT US DIV/2010115 Am. B

Enclosures: Amendment Transmittal Letter, Return post card